

### **REMARKS**

In response to the Office action dated January 29, 2007, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the above claim amendments and the following remarks. Applicants respectfully submit that the claims as presented are in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-34 are pending in the present Application while claims 1-34 are rejected. Claims 1, 2 and 29 are amended and claim 35 is new, leaving claims 1-35 for consideration upon entry of the present amendments and following remarks.

Support for the claim amendments can at least be found in the specification, the figures, and the claims as originally filed.

No new matter has been introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration and allowance of the claims are respectfully requested in view of the above amendments and the following remarks.

### **Drawings**

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because the Examiner alleges that reference numerals "240" and "158" are both used to designate the same element in FIG. 9. A corrected drawing sheet as required by the Examiner is submitted herewith to cure the deficiencies noted by the Examiner with respect to FIG. 9.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn.

### **Specification**

The Examiner objects to the specification. The Examiner specifically states that the title of the invention is not descriptive. The Examiner suggests amending the title to "Surface Light Source Device Having Light Diffusion Portion".

The title has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the title of the invention be withdrawn.

### **Claim Objections**

Claim 31 stands objected to for informalities. The Examiner specifically states that the limitation “the sealing member” in the last line of claim 31 lacks proper antecedent basis. Applicants respectfully traverse the objection. Applicants respectfully submit that recitation of “the sealing member” in claim 31 has antecedent basis by recitation of “a sealing member” as in line 5 of claim 30 from which claim 31 depends.

Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the objection to claim 31 for lack of antecedent basis be withdrawn.

### **Response to Arguments**

In regard to Applicant’s arguments filed June 9, 2006 to the April 19, 2006 Office action, and in order to expedite the prosecution of the application, the Examiner suggests clearly defining the term “space”, as recited in claim 1, as a -- planar space--. The Examiner admits that this amendment negates the possibility of a cold cathode fluorescent tube altogether since the “planar space” can no longer be interpreted as a cylindrical space. Claim 1 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner.

Further, claim 1 has been amended to define the first and second substrates as “first and second substrates of the light source”, which admittedly prevents the Examiner from broadly interpreting the respective substrates and ensuring that the substrates belong to the “planar space” and hence define the light source more clearly.

Claim 29 has been amended in accordance with the amended claim 1.

Lastly, claim 2 has been amended as suggested by the Examiner and claim 35 depending from claim 2 is new to further define recitation of “integrally formed”.

Applicants are grateful for the Examiner’s suggestions for amendments to define over the prior art in order to expedite prosecution and put the application in a condition for allowance.

Accordingly, based on the suggested amendments to independent claim 1, from which claims 2-35 depend, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-35 define over the prior art as admitted by the Examiner.

**Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103**

Claims 1-3, 14-28, 29, 30 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suga et al. (European Patent No. 1,447,785, hereinafter “Suga”) in view of Torihara et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,066,920, hereinafter “Torihara”). The Examiner states that Suga discloses all of the elements of the claims 1-3 and 14-28 except, *the use of a voltage applying part*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 9 of Torihara. The Examiner states that Suga discloses all of the elements of claims 29, 30 and 34 except, *the limitation of a receiving container to receive and securely hold the display panel and the surface light source device*, which the Examiner further states would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, and *the use of a voltage applying part*, which the Examiner states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 9 of Torihara.

Claims 4-6, 11-13 and 30-31 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suga in view of Torihara and further in view of Okajima (U.S. Patent No. 6,072,276, hereinafter “Okajima”). The Examiner states that Suga in view of Okajima discloses all of the elements of the abovementioned claims except, *a sealing layer is formed between the at least one partition and the first substrate so that the space is sealed at a contact area between the at least one partition and the first substrate; a first sealing layer is formed between the sealing member and the first substrate, and a second sealing layer is formed between the sealing member and the second substrate; and the space is defined by surfaces of the first and second substrates, the at least one partition and the sealing member, the surfaces are coated with a fluorescent layer*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 1, column 2, lines 41-55, column 2, lines 23-26, column 10 lines 39-45 and column 10 line 63 to column 11 line 5).

Claims 7-10 and 32-33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suga in view of Torihara and further in view of Okajima and further in view of Winsor (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0117959, hereinafter "Winsor"). The Examiner states that Suga in view of Torihara and further in view of Okajima disclose all of the elements of claims 7, 8 and 32 except, *the surfaces of the first and second substrates have areas in contact with the at least one partition and remaining areas not in contact with the at least one partition, the fluorescent layer being formed on the remaining areas of the surfaces of the first and second substrates; the fluorescent layer is formed on the surfaces of the at least one partition which include a surface in contact with the sealing layer*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in FIG. 5, paragraphs 7, 22-23, 34, and 37 of Winsor. The Examiner states that Suga in view of Torihara and further in view of Okajima disclose all of the elements of claims 9, 10 and 33 except, *a light reflecting layer formed between the fluorescent layer and the surfaces of the second substrate and the least one partition; the light reflecting layer is made of material including aluminum oxide or titanium oxide*, which the Examiner further states is disclosed primarily in paragraphs 32 and 34 of Winsor.

Claims 29, 30 and 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Suga in view of Torihara.

Applicants respectfully traverse all of the above § 103(a) rejections for at the least the reasons presented above. In particular, the Applicants submit that the amendments to claims 1 and 2, as suggested by the Examiner in the Examiner's response to arguments on page 15 of the instant Detailed Action, as well as the amendments to claim 29, admittedly define over the prior art of record.

Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 1-34 under § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Reconsideration and withdrawal of the relevant rejection of claims 1-35 under § 103(a) is thus respectfully requested.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that this application be allowed and a Notice of Allowance issued. If the Examiner believes that a telephone conference with Applicants' attorneys would be advantageous to the disposition of this case, the Examiner is cordially requested to telephone the undersigned.

In the event the Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks deems additional fees to be due in connection with this application, Applicants' attorney hereby authorizes that such fee be charged to Deposit Account No. 06-1130.

Respectfully submitted,

CANTOR COLBURN LLP

By: /James J. Merrick/  
James J. Merrick  
Reg. No. 43,801  
Confirmation No. 2032  
CANTOR COLBURN LLP  
55 Griffin Road South  
Bloomfield, CT 06002  
PTO Customer No. 23413  
Telephone (860) 286-2929  
Facsimile (860) 286-0115

Date: April 30, 2007